ABSTRACT
        The author makes three assumptions in discussing the
effect of collective negotiations on teachers' sense of alienation:
first, alienation is a multidimensional concept that, in this
context, is taken to derive from within the organizational setting of
the school system; second, school systems are organized as
bureaucracies containing more or less the general characteristics of
Weber's "ideal type" bureaucracy; and third, negotiations in school
systems deal with both the centralization of authority and the rule
structure of the organization. The conceptual scheme based on these
assumptions is that teacher alienation from work, the sense of
powerlessness and meaninglessness, is related to the extent to which
the bureaucratic structure of the school provides the means for
teachers to become involved in the decisions affecting the rules and
regulations governing their work. The negotiation process is seen as
a means whereby teachers may have increased input into the
decision-making authority of the organization and, consequently,
provide a rule structure that has more meaning to them. Three
hypotheses are derived as a guide to further research. What is
critical is the degree to which the negotiation process is truly a
joint decision-making one and the nature of the rule structure that
develops from the negotiations. (Author/IRT)

ED117846

EA 007 910

ALIENATION AND THE NEGOTIATION PROCESS

Charles F. Adams

Introduction and Statement of the Problem

The perspective of this paper involves the concept of alienation from work as it relates to the negotiating process. A conceptual framework is developed in the first part of the paper followed by a brief review of selected studies and writings which lend support to the conceptualization. Finally, three hypotheses are derived as a guide to further research into the relationships.

Collective negotiations between teacher groups and boards of education are a fairly recent phenomena. In the last few years legislation has been enacted in most states formalizing negotiations in the public sector including education. Initially, the thrust of teachers' associations and unions in negotiations was to obtain increases in salaries and wages. More recently, these teacher groups appear to be directing increased attention to demands for greater involvement in policy formulation and decision-making processes of school systems. Wynn, in examining the forces that are generating this thrust, points out that, "Another factor that has prompted the disenchantment of teachers is the stultifying effect of bureaucratic administrative organi-zation, particularly in many large school systems, upon the dignity of the teacher."[1] It would seem that prior to the introduction of collective negotiations teachers did not feel they had a satisfactory process through which to influence the operation of their school system.

The concept of alienation has received much attention in the literature of the behavioral sciences in the past ten years, especially the sense of alienation a worker in modern bureaucratic organizations experiences. More recently, studies of problems in organizations have focused on the sense of

alienation the work force feels as an outgrowth of the bureaucratic structure.[2]

Within the school organization an understanding of the teachers' sense of

alienation may provide some insight to the impact of collective negotiations.

The question this paper will examine is: Has the advent of

collective negotiations had any relationship to teachers' sense of alien-

ation?

Basic Assumptions and Definitions of Terms

A basic assumption of this paper is that alienation is a multi-

dimensional concept. In his study Kolesar found support for the logically

distinct and measurable variants of the five basic components of alienation

listed by Seeman.[3] They are: powerlessness, meaninglessness, anomie, iso-

lation, and self-estrangement.[4]

The sense of alienation a person has in any work situation can be

thought of as that generalized sense of anomie or estrangement from the

world at large and the sense of powerlessness, meaninglessness, and iso-

lation one has that is directly associated with the work situation. It is

Barakat's contention that, " . . . alienation from society or the world at

large is different from alienation from a certain specific system such as a

school."[5] Or, as Kolesar states, it can focus on a specific object; in this

case the object is the school. Etzioni also differentiates between personal

disorganization and alienation that is the result of power wielding in a

social organization. He says:

> . . . the term [alienation] reminds us that varying applications
> and kinds of power create different kinds of subject-and-power-
> wielder relationships and affect the totality of social organi-
> zation. Thus, if one kind of social organization relies to a
> greater extent on force to advance its goals than another, this
> will affect not only the psychic states of those subjected to
> the exercise of power but also the pattern of the relevant social

structure and most social relations within it. For instance,
the application of power is expected to increase the distance
between the members of the social unit and the fruits of their
labor, render their social world less meaningful, and make
the social structure less responsive. Thus, alienation has
both subjective and objective facets -- the psychic states of
the subjects and power-wielders and the patterns of the
societal unit.[6]

For the purpose of the present formulation, a teacher's sense of

alienation that develops out of the work situation is to be examined, not his

sense of anomie or estrangement. Or, in Etzioni's terms, the sense of

alienation that is part of the pattern of the social unit not the psychic

states of the individual. The paper will focus on the teachers' sense of

alienation that arises within the organizational setting of the school system.

This notion will be referred to as alienation from work and is defined as

the sense of powerlessness a teacher feels over the work situation and his

sense of non-involvement in the organization. As Seeman states, "This variant

of alienation [powerlessness] can be conceived as the expectancy or probability

held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence

of the outcome, or reinforcements, he seeks [in the work situation]."[7]

A second assumption of this paper is that school systems are organized

as bureaucracies containing more or less the general characteristics of

Weber's "ideal type" bureaucracy. The four major characteristics ascribed

to bureaucracies are: task specialization, hierarchy of authority, a system

of rules and regulations, and impersonality.[8] Two of these characteristics,

centralization of authority and a system of rules and regulations, are assumed

to be more closely associated with a teacher's sense of alienation than the

others. It is contended that the system of rules and regulations form the

basis for access to power or authority positions in school organizations. It

provides the means to accomplish the purposes and objectives of the staff.

When access to authority or power positions is felt to be minimal, teachers

may feel powerless and meaningless in their work roles.

Collective negotiations is a formalized process whereby represent-

atives of an employee group, in this case teachers, meet with the school

board or its representatives to jointly determine salaries and working

conditions.[9] The result of this process is a written agreement, " . . . on

a basic rule system to govern the work relationship and organized arrange-

ments for resolving disagreements and problems as they arise day-to-day."[10]

Thus, the third and final assumption is that negotiations in school systems

deal with both the centralization of authority and the rule structure of the

organization.

These assumptions then form the basis of this conceptual scheme.

Teacher alienation from work, their sense of powerlessness and meaningless-

ness, is related to the extent to which the bureaucratic structure of the

school provides the means for teachers to become involved in the decisions

affecting the rules and regulations governing their work. The negotiation

process is seen as a means whereby teachers may have increased input into the

decision-making authority of the organization, and subsequently providing a

rule structure that has more meaning to them.

Recent Research on Teacher Alienation

Barakat in a study conducted in Michigan in 1966 found that a teacher's

sense of alienation was directly related to the degree of bureaucracy in a

school system.[11] The more highly bureaucraticly structured the school system,

the greater was the teacher's sense of alienation. This author in a study

completed in 1969 found a significant correlation between teachers' perceptions

of the organizational structure of schools and their sense of alienation. The

conclusion drawn was that, ". . . when teachers perceive a high degree of

centralization of authority and rule structure in the school's organization,

they tend to feel more alienated from their work and from their fellow

workers."[12]

In this same study it was also found that:

> The leadership style of the building principal was found to be
> significantly related to the sense of alienation of the teachers.
> The executive professional leadership of the principal, [as
> defined by Gross and measured by his scale] . . . had a strong
> negative correlation with both alienation from work (-.49) and
> alienation from fellow workers (-.43).[13]

Racz, in a study conducted recently (1970), attempted to verify the

relationship between teachers' sense of alienation from work and the leader-

ship style of the building principal. He concludes:

> It would appear from these test results that leadership which
> is perceived to be "Person-Oriented" is associated with lessening
> an individual's sense of alienation from work. This finding
> supports Moeller and Charter's (1966) study which found that
> teachers who interact on a "personal" level with their principal
> perceive a higher sense of power in their roles than do teachers
> who do not. This test result is also consonant with Adams' (1969)
> study which found a high correlation between leadership behavior
> characterized by consideration of the teacher as a "person" and
> alienation from work.[14]

Weinberg, McHugh, and Lamb in a study conducted under a contract with

the U. S. Office of Education examined whether various contexts of work-

personality, role, and organization -- had a relationship to various forms of

teacher alienation. They hypothesized that an incongruence of the demands of

the three variables would be related with a high sense of teacher alienation.

Their findings did not support this contention.

> As an explanation, degree of integration between facets of social
> organization suffered a serious blow. It was further diminished
> when we discovered that focus, or substantive activity (student
> vs. content) was more regularly associated with alienation. Our
> evidence indicates that it is not the integration of demand, but
> the substance of demand that makes man alienated.[15]

When they examined the relationship between four types of school organi-
zation with teacher alienation, they found that alienation was positively related
in schools organized rather traditionally around subject specialties that
focused on future occupations and a consistant negative relationship between
alienation and schools organized with .... or individual student develop-
ment [16]   They explain this finding in terms of the rule structure of
bureaucracy

> If we take the school as organization, however, we must note
> that some kinds of schools are positively related to alienation,
> others negatively related, and thus, given that all schools
> exhibit bureaucracy, not all bureaucracy is bad (assuming that
> alienation is bad, but even this is not always justified). The
> reason that bureaucracy is bad, so the argument goes, is because
> bureaucracy constrains its members in the sense that bureaucracy
> is rule-governed   The point here is that, given the consistently
> negative relation between the Individual Development organization
> and alienation, and accepting the idea that all bureaucracies are
> rule-governed, we must question the assumption that all rule-
> governed people will be constrained in an alienative way. Appar-
> ently, the rules of Individual Development schools, which focus
> upon the student and his own particular capacities and interests,
> free the teacher to the extent that he conceives his work and
> himself as integrated. . . Bureaucracy is not inevitably related
> to alienation; the existence of rules doesn't generate disaffec-
> tion, but the kind and quality of those rules do. It is essential
> that we think of modern life . . . not as the comparison of the
> existence of rules against the absence of rules, but rather as a
> comparison of rules that engender freedom against rules that do
> not [17]

Relationship Between Negotiations and Teacher Aleination

If indeed there is a relationship between a teacher's sense of alien-
ation and the organizational structure of schools as the research seems to
indicate, then there may also be a relationship between teacher alienation
and the negotiation process. The thrust of teachers to become more in-
volved in the decision-making process affecting their work situation might
be considered a manifestation of their desire to reduce their sense

of alienation from work. The negotiations process, when it is truly a joint

decision-making process, is a modification or movement away from the traditional

centralization of authority characteristic of bureaucratic school system

organization. If the teacher's sense of alienation from work is related to

the extent of centralization of authority in the school organization and the

degree of centralization of authority is related to the negotiations process,

then the teacher's sense of alienation is related to the negotiations process.

Hypothesis 1: There is an inverse relationship between teachers' sense

of alienation from work and the extent to which collective negotiations is a

joint decision-making process

This hypothesis, if confirmed, indicates the potential of the negoti-

ations process for increasing the sense of power of teachers. If they are

accorded the ability to have a meaningful share of the decision-making power,

which by definition is a reduction in the centralization of decision-making

authority in schools, then their sense of alienation from work in terms of

powerlessness will be low. However, data from recent studies on the impact

of negotiations are not conclusive in this regard though they do lean in the

direction of support.

In a case study of 22 school districts conducted by Perry and Wildman

they state:

> The establishment of a collective bargaining relationship can
> significantly alter the distribution of power among the various
> groups with interest in the schools and, in extreme cases, may
> grant to teachers an effective veto power in the decision-making
> process . . . Collective bargaining assures teachers of access
> to the centers of decision-making power in a school system.[18]

At the same time, Perry and Wildman indicate that the negotiations process,

as it currently exists, serves to shift a great deal of the practical decision-

making power in the organization to a few top level administrators. They also

say this has been at the expense of the school principal, ". . . whose dis-

cretion is eroded by the central policy decisions required in negotiations.

The result is resentment and disaffection among principals."[19] They state

further that, "There is some similar centralization of decision-making on the

teacher side of the relationship."[20] The few chosen teacher representatives,

even though elected democratically, have the authority to make decisions for

all the teachers This does not generally allow for inputs from minority seg-

ments of the teaching force but usually represents the interests of the more

militant and politically active segment. It might be posited that those

teachers who see their viewpoints as being represented in negotiations will

be less alienated, while those who are not in accord with the teacher

negotiations would have an increased sense of alienation in that they no

longer have the traditional informal means of influence available as a result

of the specification of formal negotiations procedures.

Included in the definition of negotiations is its establishment of a

system of rules as an outgrowth of the negotiations process. A rigid system

of rules and regulations governing teachers' work relationships was seen to

have a direct relationship with teachers' sense of alienation from work and

fellow workers. Again through the same process of logical reasoning as

applied in the first hypothesis, a relationship between collective negotiations

and the teachers' sense of alienation is hypothesized.

Hypothesis 2: There is a direct relationship between the teachers'

sense of alienation from work and the degree to which the negotiation process

increases the proliferation and specificity of rules governing the teachers'

work relationships.

As Weinberg et. al. found in their study teachers were less alienated

when the rules governing teachers' work allowed them the freedom to focus

upon individual students. In a school setting where diversity of teacher role

is the norm, there does not seem to be the sense of alienation that is found

in a school system, ". . . which has institutionalized the standards for those

within it . - "[21], especially those schools integrated along the lines of a

content focus. "Alienation is built into such a system by its very existence,

an existence which by other standards might be called 'smooth running'."[22]

Unless the result of collective negotiations is a set of policy guidelines and

rules that frees teachers to work with students in ways they see appropriate,

there will probably be very little reduction in the teachers' sense of

alienation from work.

If the rule structure is established jointly through the negotiations

process, then the specified work relationships could be considered more

satisfactory to the teacher group and the administration. Administrators,

especially principals, would be less involved in developing and initiating

task structures and would have more time and energy to devote to "person

oriented" concerns. Principals exhibiting t' is type of leadership behavior

were found to be associated with a lower sense of alienation from work by

teachers.

Hypothesis 3: There is an inverse relationship between the teachers'

sense of alienation from work and the extent to which the negotiations process

produces a mutually satisfactory rule structure to both the teachers and the

principals.

Based upon the contention of Fromm[23] and the findings of Racz's study

there is some evidence to partially support this hypothesis. Fromm associated

impersonal management with worker alienation and Racz found a significantly

negative correlation between "person oriented" principal behavior and teacher

alienation.[24] Whether in fact collective negotiations will result in principal

behavior that is teacher oriented is somewhat doubtful at this point. The

stance of·many teacher organizations especially the AFT is that of excluding

principals and other administrators from membership. This is a movement away

from a professional colleague relationship increasing the distance between

principals and teachers   Even boards of education, as Perry and Wildman point

out, would prefer to have all administrators disassociated from the "rank-and-

file" of teachers and aligned with the board. At this point in time, it

appears that principals find the results of negotiations something less than

satisfactory.

There appears to be a contradiction between the relationships assumed

in Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 and between the relationships specified in

Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3. This apparent contradiction is a superficial

one   The negotiation process is seen as having either a reinforcing influence

on the school system's bureaucratic structure and thus increasing the

teachers' sense of alienation or as the procedure whereby new system structures

can be devised that may reduce the teachers' sense of alienation. What is

critical is the degree to which the process is truly a joint decision-making

one and the nature of the rule structure that develops from the negotiations.

The question is what impact collective negotiations in education will have on

freezing the present structure and administrative practices of the educational

organization? Collective negotiations could produce an agreement that formal-

izes the rules governing the work relationships so that it inhibits the

personal interaction of teachers with each other, with building principals,

and limit their freedom of interaction with students thus increasing their

sense of alienation. On the other hand, collective negotiations offers the

possibility to truly involve teachers and principals jointly in decisions
affecting their work, and therefore, reducing their sense of powerlessness
and noninvolvement

Dr. Vantine has indicated that the negotiations process has more than
one form   If the negotiations process in operation in a school system is of
the hard bargaining type, it is doubtful that lower teacher alienation from
work will be an outcome. However, if the negotiations process takes the form
of mutual accommodation then there is a greater likelihood of reduced teacher
alienation from work

R e f e r e n c e s

1. D. Richard Wynn, Policies of Educational Negotiations, a research mono-
    graph published by the Tri-State Area School Study Council, Pitts-
    burgh, 1967.

2. Michael Aiken and Jerald Hage, "Organizational Alienation: A Comparative
    Analysis," American Sociological Review, Vol. 31 (August 1966);
    and Charles F. Adams, "The Relationship of Teacher Alienation to
    the Organizational Structure of Schools." Unpublished doctoral
    dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1969.

3. H. Kolesar, "Bureaucratic Organizational Structure and Student Alien-
    ation." (A paper presented at the American Educational Research
    Association, Chicago, 1968), p. 3.

4. Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological
    Review, Vol. 24 (December 1959), p. 784.

5. Halim I. Barakat, "Alienation from the School System: Its Dynamics and
    Structure," (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of
    Michigan, 1966), p. 15.

6. Amitai Etzioni, The Active Society (New York: The Free Press, 1968),
    p. 352.

7   Seeman, op. cit., p. 784.

8   Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Translated
    by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: The Free Press
    of Glencoe, 1947), pp. 329-336.

9. This definition is similar to that of Michael H. Moskow found in "The
    Emergence and Future of Negotiations in Education," Scope, Vol. 1
    (May 1967), a publication of A Cooperative Effort Serving Suffolk
    Education.

10. Chester A. Newland, "Collective Bargaining Concepts: Applications in
    Government," Public Administration Review, Vol. 28 (March 1968),
    p. 118.

11 Barakat, op. cit.

12 Op. cit., Adams.

13 Ibid., pp. 56-59.

14. Leslie Racz, "A Study of Teacher Alienation and Its Relationship to
    Individual Needs and Leadership Behavior." (Unpublished doctoral
    dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1970).

15. Carl Weinberg, Peter McHugh, Howard Lamb, "Context of Teacher Alienation."
    U. S. Office of Education, Research Project No. 5-0340-2-12-1.
    University of California, Los Angeles, January 1968, p. 69.

16. Ibid., p 40.

17. Ibid., pp. 40-41.

18. Charles R. Perry and Wesley A. Wildman, "Collective Action by Public
    School Teachers, Volume IV." U. S. Office of Education, Research
    Project No. 2444. Chicago University, May 1968, pp. 4-5.

19. Ibid., pp. 30-31.

20 Ibid.

21 Op. cit., Weinberg, McHugh and Lamb, p. 31.

22 Ibid.

23 Erich Fromm, The Sane Society (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston,
    1955).

24. Op cit , Racz.